

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 5, and FIG. 8.

The sheet, which includes FIGs. 5-6, replaces the original sheet including FIGs. 5-6. FIG. 5 has been amended to correct a typographical error in the text of FIG. 5 above element 503. No new matter has been added.

The sheet, which includes only FIG. 8, replaces the original sheet including only FIG. 8. FIG. 8 has been amended to correct a typographical error with respect to element 802. Furthermore, elements 804 and 805 were renumbered to 803 and 804 respectively to mirror the text on page 10 paragraph [0045] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement sheets.

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **3 April 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-36. The drawings were objected to because FIG 8. has a misspelling. Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-8, 11-18, 20-28 and 31-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huitema (US Pub. No. 2004/0010683 hereinafter "'683"). Claims 9, 19 and 29 were rejected as being obvious to one of ordinary skills at the time the invention was made. Claim 10, 20 and 30 were rejected as being obvious to one of ordinary skills at the time the invention was made.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicant amended the specification to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to for a typographical error in element 802 of FIG. 8. Applicant has amended FIG. 8 to correct the typographical error in element 802. Furthermore, Applicant has amended FIG. 8 to mirror the element numbers in the text on page 10, paragraph [0045] of the instant application.

Additionally, Applicant has amended FIG. 5 to correct a typographical error in the text above element 503. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The claims were rejected as being indefinite. More specifically, independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected for use of the relative term "too large." Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the cryptographic data is larger than a single field. This amendment finds support on page 4, paragraph [0011] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Furthermore, Examiner asserts that Applicant's use of the clause "whereby..." fails to limit the scope of the claims since it does not require steps or structures that would yield the recited results. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to limit the scope of the claims to cryptographic data that is larger than a single field. This amendment finds support on page 4, paragraph [0011] of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 33, and 35 were rejected as being anticipated by Huitema. Applicant respectfully points out that the passages cited by the Examiner (Huitema, paragraphs [0023]-[0024], [0027], and [0033]) disclose including a digital fingerprint with a network address that is part of a message. When a second device receives the message, the second device uses this digital fingerprint to verify the computing device that sent the message. Note that Huitema suffers from the same drawback of having limited space available for the security value as is described on page 3, paragraph [0006] of the instant application in relation to prior authentication solutions.

In contrast, the present invention, teaches encapsulating cryptographic data into multiple fields associated with different network layers of a protocol stack, such as the transport layer and the data link layer of the OSI model. To accomplish this, the system of the present invention divides the cryptographic data into multiple pieces and encapsulates each piece within a different field (see page 7, paragraph [0032], and page 8, paragraph [0034] of the instant application). This enables the system to include security information that is larger than a single field within a packet.

There is nothing within Huitema that discloses dividing cryptographic data into multiple pieces and encapsulating the pieces of cryptographic data within multiple fields associated with different network layers of a protocol stack.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 33, and 35 to clarify that the present invention encapsulates different pieces of the

cryptographic data in fields associated with different network layers of a protocol stack in a data packet, wherein the cryptographic data is larger than a single field, and wherein the cryptographic data is encapsulated within multiple fields associated with different network layers of the protocol stack. These amendments find support on page 7, paragraph [0032], and on page 8, paragraph [0034]. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 33, and 35 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, claims 22-30, which depend upon claim 21, claim 32, which depends upon claim 31, claim 34, which depends upon claim 33, and claim 36, which depends upon claim 35, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 2 July 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com